

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
AIRS ID#: 1170373 DATE: <u>1/19/12</u>	ARRIVE: <u>10:19</u>	DEPART: <u>11:23</u>	
FACILITY NAME: PREMIX MARBLETITE-W	INTER SPRINGS		
FACILITY LOCATION: 325 OLD SANFO	ORD OVIEDO RD		
WINTER SPRING	GS 32708-2627		
	F JIMMY FOLK Mobile PHONI Mobile 8/2014 date)	E:	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Julio Cana Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still JIMMY For If no, who is?: <u>Julio Canas - Production Manager</u>		☐ Yes ⊠No	
If different, did the facility provide an administration 3. Is the facility contact still?			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during too If yes, was the compliance authority notified at I	ay's inspection?east 15 days in advance?	☐ Yes	

Emissions Unit Section 3 Plant-Silo#1 (xo marble), wsilotop baghouse, 100T cap subject to Reasonable Precautions

I –CCB Plant-Silo#1 (xo marble), willotop baghouse, 1001 cap subject to Reasonable Precautions			
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
Date of last inspection: 7/27/09 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards 1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconemissions by:	nfined		
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of a 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	Yes No O Yes No		
The state of			
If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	Yes No No No		

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-Silo#2(G260 crushed marble),wsilotop baghouse,100T subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	•
Date of last inspection: 7/27/09 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \[\Delta \text{N/A} \] c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by: a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	e following:	□ No□ No□ No□ No
 b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 	🗌 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-Silo#3(FED white cement), wsilotop baghouse, 100Tcap subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	
 Date of last inspection: 7/27/09 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	- Yes	No No No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by: Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	following: - Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No
 b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 	- Yes	□ No□ No□ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-Silo#4(20-65gr quartz sand), wsilotop baghouse, 100T subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	•
Date of last inspection: 7/27/09 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		No No No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check 🗹	only one
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	box for each	question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control uncor emissions by:	nfined	
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of t 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	X Yes	☐ No
control emissions?		☐ No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	of	☐ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?		□ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		□ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section 10 –CCB Plant-3-100 & 1-75cu.ft mixers/4-baggers w/cent.baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	•
Date of last inspection: 7/27/09 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	- Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfiremissions by: Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	following: - Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No
 b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 	- 🗌 Yes	□ No□ No□ No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			
				Į.
1.	b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?	\boxtimes	Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		Yes	⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		Yes	⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propane. 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane.	<u>1e/yr</u> :/yr	· < 1.00)?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consump for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	otion	Yes	☐ No
_				
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control			
_	devices?	-	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		Yes	☐ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?	\bowtie	Yes	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?			□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocation concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary</i> ,	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	m by telephone, g location?
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days program.3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or	ior to relocation? Yes No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate p a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is If YES, what was the purpose?	permit:
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
 Administrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or autiassociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been 	horized representative not any emissions units or at the facility? Yes No
a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different d. A change in ownership?	?
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the a 30 days prior to the change?	
Wanda Parker-Garvin	1/19/12
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Insp	ection
Wanda Parker Lawin	
Inspector's Signature Approximate	e Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Ms. Wanda Parker-Garvin made contact with Mr. Julio Canas, Production Manager with Premix Marbletite. Ms. Parker-Garvin informed Mr. Canas that she was there to conduct a compliance inspection. Mr. Canas stated he had been the onsite Production Manager for less than a year. Ms. Parker-Garvin asked if the Department had been informed of the change in facility

contact. Mr. Canas stated no. The facility uses various raw materials to manufacturer of stucco, plaster, and pool products. Ms. Parker-Garvin reviewed the last VE report and Production Summary Report. The facility produced 106 tons of product the previous calendar year. The emission units consist of 10 100-ton storage silos with baghouses to control the PM from raw materials, including crushed marble, white cement and quartz sand. Ms. Parker-Garvin asked Mr. Canas about the additional baghouses she observed located on the roof in the northeast corner of the building. Mr. Canas stated the five (5) extra baghouses were for the five (5) existing 75-ton capacity silos, but are not operational. He stated material will be pumped over to the additional silos, but there will not be an increase in the facility production rate or incoming raw materials. Ms. Parker-Garvin asked Mr. Canas to notify the Department anytime there the facility contact changes. Mr. Canas stated the facility repaved the entrance and parking lot last August to better control dust, and there are no emergency generators or diesel fuel on site. The facility uses propane to operate forklift, ,and trucks are gased off-site. Mr. Canas accompanied Ms. Parker-Garvin on a walkthough of the facility. The equipment/baghouses were in good condition. Mr. Canas mentioned the facility had plans to put an additional screen on the shaker for larger volumes of production. Ms. Parker-Garvin advised Mr. Canas to update the contact information for the facility.

rec'd original 2/9/12 rec'd revised 2/10/12